



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner argued that the claims as currently filed fail to particularly point out and distinctly define the metes and bounds of the subject matter of which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner further argued that the claims (esp. Claims 28 and 32) are confusing and that the essential structural cooperative relationships of the elements are extraordinarily unclear and ambiguous. In an effort to advance prosecution, the Examiner proposed various changes be made to Claims 28, 32-36, 40-44, and 53 in order to ensure that the claims are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous while avoiding antecedent basis issues throughout. Applicant agreed to the Examiner's suggestions.